



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECORD OF BIRDS BANDED

(Bands: 28811-28819, 48101-48119, 52201-52230, 56421, 56426.)

J. E. Law, at Berkeley, Calif., February 22 to March 25, 1921:

Zonotrichia coronata, (3) 52206,-10,-11. *Pipilo c. crissalis*, (4) 52201,-02,-08,*Junco oreganus* (subsp.), (12), 48101-56426.

48112.

Passerella i. fuliginosa, (2) 52207,-09. *Pipilo m. falcifer*, (2) 52203,-05.*Passerella i. sinuosa*, (1) 52204.

At Bluff Lake, San Bernardino Mts., Calif., August 21 to 30, 1921:

Junco o. thurberi, (9) 48113-48119, 52212,-13. *Oreospiza chlorura*, (25) 28811-28819, 52214-52218, 52220-52230.*Passerella i. stephensi*, (1) 52219.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

It seems curious, when one comes to think of it, how prevalent has become the notion among amateur observers of birds that the field-glass is an indispensable part of their equipment. There is, to be sure, no question but that the field-glass is very helpful to many individual observers, and that for purposes of patient and *detailed* study of the behavior of birds in the wild it is truly essential to the few persons who engage in such close studies. But the claim that the field-glass is at all "necessary" to the average run of field observers is, we believe, unjustified. We even aver that addiction to the use of the instrument in question is a hindrance rather than a help in the enjoyment of birds out-of-doors, as well as in the gathering of many of the facts of scientific value concerning them. Our point is that birds out-of-doors are things that in better degree than most other living beings can be seen and watched with the unaided human eye. And what humans need right now is to exercise their senses of sight and hearing in normal fashion—to get away from all those artificialities which go to make up the oppressing burden of "civilization". Bird study afield should take its place as a wholly *natural* recreation, because the nervous and muscular activities which it brings into play are of primitive sorts. Their exercise will tend to restore the proper balance of mind and body, in just so far as they are used in a perfectly normal way. The use of glasses, save in cases of injury or disease on the part of the observer, detracts from the full measure of benefit to be derived. As regards the element of sport in identifying species, there is surely far more "good fun" in naming the birds without the use of any artificial device. Furthermore, the person who is dependent only on his naked eye can make a bigger census both of individuals and species. At least, the most accurate and at the same time rapid bird-counter we know personally,

uses no glasses. And as for gathering facts in regard to behavior of birds, dependence upon glasses means cutting out a lot of the horizon, failure of appreciation of goings on at large while focussed upon details. We have been impressed with the number of things our opera-glass companion did *not* see, at least as much as with the number of things he said he saw that we without glasses had failed to see!

Attention is directed to Mr. Law's note upon bird banding on page 196 of this issue. Here is a method of bird study that should appeal to those who wish to contribute observations of value, yet without killing birds. The possibilities of such work have already been well demonstrated by Mr. S. Prentiss Baldwin (see his Bird Banding by Means of Systematic Trapping, Proceedings Linnaean Society of New York, December, 1919; Recent Returns from Trapping and Banding Birds, Auk, April, 1921, pp. 228-237; The Marriage Relations of the House Wren, *idem*, pp. 237-244). The United States Biological Survey stands ready to cooperate with anyone taking up the work, and *THE CONDOR*, through Mr. Law, will supply space in its columns for the record of birds as banded locally and of banded birds later recorded.

In building their new home, at Jennings Lake, near Portland, Oregon, Mr. and Mrs. William L. Finley have provided a concrete vault for the safe housing of films and records. Their collections now contain close to 200,000 feet of movie negative of birds and mammals, as well as some 10,000 still-life negatives. Last spring and early summer were spent in southern California where some good pictures were secured.

A most deplorable piece of bad luck happened to Mr. Allan Brooks the past summer, of which we only recently heard in a